



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

As a nation should not, and the Almighty will not, be evaded, so let him attempt no evasion, no equivocation. And if, so answering, he can show that the soil was ours where the first blood of the war was shed, that it was not within an inhabited country, or, if within such, the inhabitants had submitted themselves to the civil authority of Texas, or of the United States, and that the same is true of the site of Fort Brown, then I am with him for his justification. I have a selfish motive for desiring that the president may do this. I expect to give some votes, which, in connection with this war, without his so doing, will be of doubtful propriety in my own judgment, but which will be free from the doubt if he does so. But if he cannot or will not do this, if on any pretense, or no pretense, he shall refuse or omit it, then I shall be fully convinced of what I more than suspect already, that he is deeply conscious of being in the wrong; that he feels the blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, is crying to heaven against him; that he ordered General Taylor into the midst of a peaceful Mexican settlement, purposely to bring on a war; that, having some strong motive, which I will not stop now to give my opinion concerning, to involve the two countries in a war, and trusting to escape scrutiny by fixing the public gaze upon the exceeding brightness of military glory, that attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood, that serpent's eye that charms to destroy, he plunged into it, and has swept on and on, till, disappointed in his calculations of the ease with which Mexico might be subdued, he now finds himself he knows not where. How like the insane mumbling of a fevered dream is the whole war part of the late message. . . . As I have said before, he knows not where he is. He is a bewildered, confounded and miserably perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show that there is not something about his conscience more painful than all his mental perplexities."

The Religious Imperialists.

The *Springfield Republican* has the following most pertinent comment on the criticism made by the *Independent*, the *Outlook* and other imperialist religious journals, on the sordid motives advanced by Senator Beveridge for retaining the Philippine Islands:

"Just why these good imperialists should jump upon the young Beveridge for planting expansion on commercial grounds is a puzzle. Perhaps they feel that if Wolcott of Colorado, with his New England training in right and justice and freedom, could be stirred to say that a forcible expansion based upon greed and glory would make the war 'a mercenary and dishonorable war, worthy of the middle ages,' they ought somehow to be stirred also to say nearly as much. We do not know as to that. But we do know that the other leading spokesmen for expansion and conquest heretofore have gone on urging the commercial profit of it as the great consideration, and the religious imperialists have not rebuked them. Why Beveridge? Why not also the President, who preached the doctrine that trade follows the flag in his earlier hold-the-Philippine speeches? Why not Peace Commissioner Frye, who has talked nothing else but trade in connection with this question? Why not Colonel Denby, who laughs at the idea of holding and shooting the Filipinos

for any other purpose? Why not Peace Commissioner Reid, who told them on his return from Paris that we had expanded to the Asiatic shore for commercial and no other reasons? He boasted of having brought home 'more property' than some people wanted. The American commissioners, he said, 'neither neglected nor feared the duty of caring for the material interests of their own country—the duty of grasping the enormous possibilities upon which we have stumbled'; and 'are we to lose all this through a mushy sentimentality?' And it was not the 'mushy sentimentality' of religious opposition to his 'property' reasons for expansion that he referred to, for none such was then to be found in the imperialist religious press. It is only now, when Beveridge comes forward urging the same considerations for holding the Philippines, 'and holding them forever,' in a little more striking and eloquent manner, that the religious press begins to show signs of recognizing the sordid motives which control the rest of the imperialist crowd. Can it be that the conscience of the country, in the persons of its professional keepers, is becoming growingly uneasy respecting this bloody business?

"Mr. Wolcott's position is not much of an improvement over that of Beveridge, whom he warmly rebukes. He favors the prosecution of the war on unconditional-surrender lines. He would crush the protesting Filipinos before telling them what we are going to do with them. Here is a weak little fellow prostrate on the ground, who is commanded by a big fellow jumping on him to stop his squirming and submit to being bound hand and foot. The little fellow asks that he be told what fate then awaits him after giving up every puny power of resistance he possesses, and is informed that he must shut up and submit or be killed. The killing accordingly goes on, and Mr. Wolcott praises that attitude of the American government—the attitude of an unconscionable bully. But he has performed one notable service which should go far to hide this discreditable feature of his position. He has apparently, in his rebuke to Beveridge, shamed some of the religious supporters of the Philippine aggression into making a barely audible protest against the doctrine of justification of the killing of people for the commercial profit there may come out of it."

Horrors of War — Fighting Instincts Hereditary.

FROM THE RECOLLECTIONS OF E. L. GODKIN.

Late in the spring (1853) I went to Sebastopol and was there until the place was taken. Owing to the kindness of friends in the Piedmontese army, I was enabled to visit the Malakoff either the afternoon of its capture or the following morning, I now forget which, but the burying parties were just going to work. When we reached the top of the parapet, the Russians were still dropping shells from the other side of the harbor wherever they saw a group, so that we were obliged to walk singly. The sight which met our eyes within the fort was a horrid one. Ten thousand men, as I was afterwards told, both Russians and French, lay dead within an enclosure of two or three acres, the result of an hour or two of mutual stabbing and shooting. No one, not even the youngest, could avoid the reflection that prob-